arXiv:1704.06683v1 [math.CO] 21 Apr 2017

Shifting the Phase Transition Threshold for Random Graphs and 2-SAT using Degree Constraints*

Sergey Dovgal[1,2] and Vlady Ravelomanana[2]

[1]LIPN – UMR CNRS 7030. Université Paris 13, 99 avenue Jean-Baptiste Clément, 93430 Villetaneuse. France, dovgal@lipn.univ-paris13.fr
[2]IRIF – UMR CNRS 8243. Université Paris 7, 8 place Aurélie Nemours, 75013 Paris. France, vlad@irif.fr

April 25, 2017

Abstract

We show that by restricting the degrees of the vertices of a graph to an arbitrary set Δ, the threshold point $\alpha(\Delta)$ of the phase transition for a random graph with n vertices and $m = \alpha(\Delta)n$ edges can be either accelerated (e.g., $\alpha(\Delta) \approx 0.38$ for $\Delta = \{0, 1, 4, 5\}$) or postponed (e.g., $\alpha(\Delta) \approx 0.95$ for $\Delta = \{1, 2, 50\}$) compared to a classical Erdős–Rényi random graph with $\alpha(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}) = \frac{1}{2}$. In particular, we prove that the probability of graph being nonplanar and the probability of having a complex component, goes from 0 to 1 as m passes $\alpha(\Delta)n$. We investigate these probabilities and also different graph statistics inside the critical window of transition (diameter, longest path and circumference of a complex component).

Finally, we introduce a 2-CNF model with restricted literal degrees, i.e. a model with a property analogous to that of graphs: the number of clauses that contain each variable, belongs to the set Δ. We apply our results on random graph and prove a lower bound for the probability that a formula with n variables and $m = 2\alpha(\Delta)n$ clauses is satisfiable. This probability is close to 1 for the subcritical regime $m = 2\alpha n(1 - \mu n^{-1/3})$, $\mu \to \infty$ and matches the lower bound of Bollobás, Borgs, Chayes, Kim, and Wilson ([BBC+01]) for the classical case. This implies that the phase transition threshold for 2-SAT can also be shifted by restricting the degrees of the literals.

1 Introduction

1.1 Shifting the phase transition

Consider a random Erdős–Rényi graph $G(n, m)$, that is a graph chosen uniformly at random among all simple graphs built with n vertices, conventionally labeled with distinct numbers from $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, and m edges ([ER60]). The range $m = \frac{1}{2}n(1 + \mu n^{-1/3})$ where $n \to \infty$ and μ depends on n, is of particular interest since there are three distinct regimes, according to how the crucial parameter μ grows as n is large: as $\mu \to -\infty$, the size of the largest component is of order $\Theta(\log n)$ and the connected components are almost surely trees and unicyclic components; next, inside what is known as the critical window $|\mu| = O(1)$, the largest component size is of order $\Theta(n^{2/3})$ and complex structures (unempty set of connected components having strictly more edges than vertices) start to appear with significant probabilities; finally, as $\mu \to +\infty$ with n, there is typically a unique component of size $\Theta(n)$ called the giant component. This qualitative result first appeared in the article of Erdős and Rényi [ER60]. Since then, various researchers have studied in depth the phase transition of the Erdős–Rényi random graph model culminating with the masterful work of Janson, Knuth, Łuczak, and Pittel [JKLP93] who used enumerative approaches to analyze the fine structure of components inside the critical window of $G(n, m)$.

*This work is partially supported by the project ANR-MOST MetAConC.



(a) Probability of largest excess. (b) Largest component size. (c) Graph diameter.

Figure 1: Phase transition of a random Erdős–Rényi graph.

As for random graphs, random 2-SAT formulas are of paramount importance in computer science, statistical physics and have been well studied (see for instance [BBC+01] and references therein). In the 2-SAT problem, a CNF (conjunctive normal form) formula consists of m 2-clauses of the form $x \vee y$, where x and y are literals from the set of n Boolean variables and their negations. Actually, the most accurate description of the phase transition of random 2-SAT is given in [BBC+01]. Bollobás, Borgs, Chayes, Kim, and Wilson proved that for $m = n(1 + \mu n^{-1/3})$ as $\mu \to -\infty$ with n, the formula is unsatisfiable with probability $\Theta(\mu^{-3})$; as μ is any fixed real the probability of satisfiability is $\Theta(1)$, and finally, as $\mu \to +\infty$ with n, the formula is satisfiable with probability $\exp(-O(\mu^3))$. It is then remarkable that inside their respective windows of transition, the appearance of complex components for random graphs and the SAT/UNSAT phases for random 2-SAT, the two problems behave very similarly.

The last decades have seen a growth of interest in delaying or advancing the phase transitions of random graphs (resp. random 2-CNF formula). Mainly, two kinds of processes have been introduced and studied:

a) the *Achlioptas process* where models of random graph are obtained by adding edge one by one but according to a given rule which allows to choose the next edge from a set of candidate edges [KPS13],

b) the *given degree sequence models* where a sequence $(d_1, \cdots, d_n)$ of degrees is given and a simple graph built on n vertices is uniformly chosen from the set of all graphs whose degrees match with the sequence d_i (see [MR95, HM12, JPRRar]).

In [KPS13, BF01, RW12], the authors studied the Achlioptas process. In particular, Bohman and Frieze [KPS13] were able to show that there is a random graph process such that after adding $m = 0.535\,n > 0.5\,n$ edges the size of the largest component is (still) polylogarithmic in n which contrasts with the classical Erdős–Rényi random graphs. In the models of random graphs with a fixed degree sequence $D = (d_1, \cdots, d_n)$, Joos, Perarnau, Rautenbach, and Reed [JPRRar] proved that a simple condition that a graph with degree sequence D has a connected component of linear size, is that the sum of the degrees in D which are not 2 is at least $\lambda(n)$ for some function $\lambda(n)$ that goes to infinity with n. For the random 2-SAT formulas with prescribed literal degrees, we refer to the work of Cooper, Frieze and Sorkin [CFS07].



Figure 2: Random labeled graph from $\mathcal{G}_{26,30,\Delta}$ with the set of degree constraints $\Delta = \{1, 2, 3, 5, 7\}$.

In the current work, our approach is rather different. We study *random graphs with degree constraints* that are graphs drawn uniformly at random from the set of all graphs with all vertices having degrees from a set $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $1 \in \Delta$. De Panafieu and Ramos calculated asymptotic number of such graphs using methods from analytic combinatorics [dPR16]. Using their asymptotic results, we prove that random graphs with degrees from the set Δ have their phase transition shifted from the density of edges $\frac{m}{n} = \frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{m}{n} = \alpha$ for an *explicit* and *computable* constant $\alpha = \alpha(\Delta)$ and the new critical window of transition becomes $m = \alpha n(1 \pm \mu n^{-1/3})$.

In addition, we also prove that the structure of such graphs inside this crucial window behaves as in the Erdős–Rényi case. For instance, we prove that for our constrained graphs extremal parameters such as the diameter, the circumference or the longest path are of order $\Theta(n^{1/3})$ around $m = \alpha n$. The size of complex components of our graphs are of order $\Theta(n^{2/3})$ as $\frac{(m-\alpha n)^3}{n^2}$ is bounded. A very similar result but about the diameter of the largest component of $G(n, p = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{\mu}{n^{4/3}})$ has been obtained by Nachmias and Peres in [NP08] (using very different methods).

In the seminal paper of Erdős and Rényi, amongst other non-trivial properties, they discussed the planarity of random graphs with various edge densities [ER60]. The probabilities of planarity of Erdős-Rényi random graphs inside their window of transition have been since then computed in [NRR15]. In the current work, we extend this study by showing that the planarity threshold shifts from $\frac{n}{2}$ for classical random graphs to αn for graphs with degrees from Δ. More precisely, first we show that such objects are almost surely planar as $\mu = \frac{m-\alpha n}{n^{2/3}}$ goes to $-\infty$ and non-planar as $\mu = \frac{m-\alpha n}{n^{2/3}}$ tends to $+\infty$. Next, as function of μ, we compute the limiting probability that random graphs of degrees in Δ are planar as $\mu = O(1)$.

For the 2-SAT problem, we define the *degree* of a literal as the number of clauses that contain this literal. We prove that if we impose degree constraints on a random 2-CNF formula, then the (possible) transition window with average edge density $\frac{m}{n} = 1$ is shifted to at least $\frac{m}{n} = 2\alpha(\Delta)$.

STRUCTURE OF THE ARTICLE In the next Subsection we will give preliminary notations and basic facts about random graphs and generating functions. In Section 2 we state our main results and give proofs which rely on technical statements from Section A. Next, in Section 3 we introduce our 2-CNF model and prove the lower bound for SAT probability. In Section 4, we give results of simulations and explain how two different strategies of random sampling (recursive sampling and Boltzmann sampling) can be applied to generate both random graphs and random 2-CNF formulas in our context. In Section A, we give the tools from analytic combinatorics. Then follows Section B with the method of moments and marking tools. The last section of the appendix, C compares two different models: graphs with degree constraints and graphs with given degree sequence.

1.2 PRELIMINARIES

The *excess* of a connected graph is the number of edges minus the number of vertices. For example, connected graphs with excess -1 are trees, with excess 0 —- graphs with one cycle (also known as unicycles or unicyclic graphs), connected bicycles have excess 2, and so on (see Figure 3). Connected graph always has excess at least -1. A connected component with excess at least 1, is a *complex component*. The *complex part* of a random graph is the set of its complex components.



Figure 3: Examples of connected labeled graphs with different excess. As a whole, can be considered as a graph with total excess $-1 + 0 + 1 + 2 = 2$.

Next, we introduce the notion of a 2-*core (the core)* and a 3-*core (the kernel)* of a graph. The 2-core is obtained by repeatedly removing all vertices of degree 1 (smoothing). The 3-core is obtained by repeatedly replacing vertices of degree two with their adjacent edges by a single edge connecting the neighbors of deleted vertices (we call this a *reduction procedure*). A 3-core can be a multigraph, i.e. there can be multiple edges. There is only a finite number of connected 3-cores with a given excess [JKLP93]. The inverse images of vertices of 3-core under the reduction procedure, are called *corner vertices* (cf. Figure 4). A *2-path* is an inverse image of an edge in a 3-core, i.e. a path connecting two corner vertices.

The *circumference* of a graph is the length of its longest cycle. A *diameter* of a graph is the maximal length of the shortest path over all distinct pairs of vertices. The problems of finding the longest path and the circumference are NP-hard.

Assume that $(x_1,\dots,x_m,y_1,\dots,y_m) \in \{\xi_1,\dots,\xi_n,\overline{\xi}_1,\dots,\overline{\xi}_n\}^{2m}$, and $(\xi_i)_{i=1}^n$ is a collection of n Boolean variables. Given a 2-CNF formula $\bigwedge_{i=1}^m (x_i \vee y_i)$, its *digraph representation* is the directed graph with the set of edges $\bigcup_{i=1}^m \Big((\overline{x}_i \to y_i) \cup (\overline{y}_i \to x_i)\Big)$. If there exist an assignation of the Boolean ξ_i such that each clause of the formula is satisfiable, then we say that formula is SAT, otherwise we say that it is UNSAT. A *circuit* is a directed cycle $(v_1,\dots,v_k)$ such that $v_1 = v_k$. We say that $x \rightsquigarrow y$ if there exists a directed path from x to y. Formula is UNSAT if and only if there exists i such that in its digraph representation $\xi_i \rightsquigarrow \overline{\xi}_i$, i.e. ξ_i and $\overline{\xi}_i$ belong to so-called *contradictory circuit* ([BBC+01]). See Figure 5 for an example of digraph representation.

Random graph with degree constraints is a graph sampled uniformly at random from the set of all possible graphs $\mathcal{G}_{n,m,\Delta}$ having m edges and n vertices all of degrees from the set $\Delta = \{\delta_1,\delta_2,\dots\} \subseteq \{0,1,2,\dots\}$. The set Δ can be finite or infinite but in this work, we require that $1 \in \Delta$. This technical condition allows the existence of trees and tree-like structures in the random objects under consideration.

The set $\mathcal{G}_{n,m,\Delta}$ is (asymptotically) nonempty if and only if the following condition is satisfied [dPR16]:

($\mathcal{C}$) Denote $\gcd(d_1-d_2 \colon d_1,d_2 \in \Delta)$ by *periodicity* p. Assume that the number m of edges grows linearly with the number n of vertices, with $2m/n$ staying in a fixed compact interval of $]\min(\Delta),\max(\Delta)[$, and p divides $2m - n\cdot\min(\Delta)$.

To a given arbitrary set $\Delta \subseteq \{0,1,2,\dots\}$, we associate the EGF $\omega(z)$:

$$\mathrm{SET}_\Delta(z) = \omega(z) = \sum_{d\in\Delta} \frac{z^d}{d!} \ . \tag{1}$$

The domain of the argument z of this function can be either considered a subset $[0,R)$ of real axis or some subset of complex plane, depending on the context. A *characteristic function* of $\omega(z)$, $\phi_0(z) = \frac{z\omega'(z)}{\omega(z)}$, is non-decreasing along real axis [FS09, Proposition IV.5], together with the characteristic function $\phi_1(z) = \frac{z\omega''(z)}{\omega'(z)}$ of the derivative $\omega'(z)$.

The value of the threshold α, which is used in all our theorems, is a unique solution of the system of equations

$$\begin{cases} \phi_1(\widehat{z}) = 1, \\ \phi_0(\widehat{z}) = 2\alpha. \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

To compute the value of α, we determine first the value $\widehat{z} > 0$ from $\phi_1(\widehat{z}) = 1$. The unique solution $\widehat{z}$ of $\phi_1(z) = 1, z > 0$ always exists provided that $1 \in \Delta$ and can be computed. Then, we compute $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}\phi_0(\widehat{z})$.

2 Phase Transition for Random Graphs

2.1 Structure of connected components

Recall that given a set Δ, its EGF is defined as $\omega(z) = \sum_{d\in\Delta} z^d/d!$, and characteristic function of $\omega(z)$ and its derivative $\omega'(z)$ are given by $\phi_0(z) = z\omega'(z)/\omega(z)$, $\phi_1(z) = z\omega''(z)/\omega'(z)$.

Theorem 1. *Given a set Δ with $1 \in \Delta$, let α be a unique positive solution of (2). Assume that $m = \alpha n(1+\mu n^{-1/3})$. Suppose that Condition ($\mathcal{C}$) is satisfied and $G_{n,m,\Delta}$ is a random graph from $\mathcal{G}_{n,m,\Delta}$.*

Then, as $n \to \infty$, we have

1. *if* $\mu \to -\infty$, $|\mu| = O(n^{1/12})$, *then*

$$\mathbb{P}(G_{n,m,\Delta} \text{ has only trees and unicycles}) = 1 - \Theta(|\mu|^{-3}) \ ; \tag{3}$$

2. *if* $|\mu| = O(1)$, *i.e.* μ *is fixed, then*

$$\mathbb{P}(G_{n,m,\Delta} \text{ has only trees and unicycles}) \to \textit{constant} \in (0,1) \ , \tag{4}$$
$$\mathbb{P}(G_{n,m,\Delta} \text{ has a complex part with total excess } q) \to \textit{constant} \in (0,1) \ , \tag{5}$$

and the constants are computable functions of μ*;*

3. *if* $\mu \to +\infty$, $|\mu| = O(n^{1/12})$, *then*

$$\mathbb{P}(G_{n,m,\Delta} \text{ has only trees and unicycles}) = \Theta(e^{-\mu^3/6}\mu^{-3/4}) \ , \tag{6}$$
$$\mathbb{P}(G_{n,m,\Delta} \text{ has a complex part with excess } q) = \Theta(e^{-\mu^3/6}\mu^{3q/2-3/4}) \ . \tag{7}$$

Proof of Theorem 1 (Sketched). Consider a graph composed of trees, unicycles and a collection of complex connected components. Since the total excess of complex components is q, there are exactly $(n-m+q)$ trees, because each tree has an excess -1.

Generating functions for these components are given by Lemma 1 and Lemma 2: we enumerate all possible kernels and then enumerate graphs that reduce to them under pruning and smoothing. Let $U(z)$ be the generating function for unrooted trees, $V(z)$ be the generating function for unicycles, $E_j(z)$ be the generating functions for graphs with excess j. We calculate the probability for each collection $(q_1, \dots, q_k)$, while the total excess is $\sum_{j=1}^{k} jq_j = q$. Accordingly, the probability that the process generates a graph with the described property can be expressed as the ratio

$$\frac{n! \cdot |\mathcal{G}_{n,m,\Delta}|^{-1}}{(n-m+q)!}[z^n]U(z)^{n-m+q}e^{V(z)}\frac{E_1^{q_1}(z)}{q_1!}\cdots\frac{E_k^{q_k}(z)}{q_k!} \ . \tag{8}$$

Then we use an approximation of $E_j(z)$ from Corollary 1, the Lemma 2 and apply Corollary 2 with $y = \frac{1}{2} + 3q$ in order to extract the coefficients. Note that our approach is derived from the methods from [JKLP93] but due to the place limitation, most of our proofs are sketched. □

2.2 Shifting the planarity threshold

Theorem 2. *Under the same conditions as in Theorem 1 with a number of edges* $m = \alpha n(1 + \mu n^{-1/3})$, *let* $p(\mu)$ *be the probability that* $G_{n,m,\Delta}$ *is planar.*

Then, as $n \to \infty$, *we have uniformly for* $|\mu| = O(n^{1/12})$*:*

1. $p(\mu) = 1 - \Theta(|\mu|^{-3})$, *as* $\mu \to -\infty$*;*
2. $p(\mu) \to \textit{constant} \in (0,1)$, *as* $|\mu| = O(1)$, *and* $p(\mu)$ *is computable;*
3. $p(\mu) \to 0$, *as* $\mu \to +\infty$.

Proof of Theorem 2. The graph is planar if and only if all the 3-cores (multigraphs) of connected complex components are planar. As $|\mu| = O(n^{1/12})$, Corollary 1 tells us that for asymptotic purposes it is enough to consider only cubic regular kernels among all possible planar 3-cores. Let $G_1(z)$ be an EGF of connected planar cubic kernels. The function $G_1(z)$ is determined by the system of equaitons given in [NRR15], and is computable. An EGF for SET of such components is given by $G(z) = e^{G_1(z)}$. We give several first terms of $G(z)$ according to [NRR15]:

$$G(z) = \sum_{q \geq 0} g_q \frac{z^{2q}}{(2q)!^2} = 1 + \frac{5}{24}z^2 + \frac{385}{1152}z^4 + \frac{83933}{82944}z^6 + \frac{35002561}{7962624}z^8 + \dots \tag{9}$$

Thus, the number of planar cubic kernels with total excess q is given by $(2q)![z^{2q}]e^{G_1(z)} = (2q)![z^{2q}]G(z) = \frac{g_q}{(2q)!}$. In order to calculate $p(\mu)$, we sum over all possible $q \geq 0$ and multiply the probabilities that the

3-core is a planar cubic graph with excess q by the conditional probability that a random graph has planar cubic kernel of excess q.

The probability that $G_{n,m,\Delta}$ is planar on condition that the excess of the complex component is q, is equal to

$$\frac{n!|\mathcal{G}_{n,m,\Delta}|^{-1}}{(n-m+q)!}[z^n]U(z)^{n-m+q}e^{V(z)}\frac{g_q}{(2q)!}\frac{(T_3(z))^{2r}}{(1-T_2(z))^{3r}} \ . \tag{10}$$

We can apply Corollary 2 and sum over all $q \geq 0$ in order to obtain the result: explicitly we have

$$p(\mu) \sim \sqrt{2\pi}\sum_{q\geq 0} g_q t_3^{2q} A_\Delta(3q+\tfrac{1}{2},\mu) \ , \tag{11}$$

where $A_\Delta(3q+\frac{1}{2},\mu)$ is the function from Corollary 2. The probabilities on the borders of the transition window can be obtained from the properties of the function $A_\Delta(y,\mu)$. □

2.3 Statistics of the complex component inside the critical window

Theorem 3. *Under the same conditions as in Theorem 1, suppose that* $|\mu| = O(1)$, $m = \alpha n(1+\mu n^{-1/3})$. *Then, the longest path, diameter and circumference of a complex component are of order* $\Theta(n^{1/3})$ *in probability, i.e. for each mentioned random parameter there exist computable constants* $A, B > 0$ *depending on* Δ *such that the corresponding random variable* X_n *satisfies* $\forall \lambda > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_n \notin n^{1/3}(A \pm B\lambda)\right) = O(\lambda^{-2}) \ . \tag{12}$$



Figure 4: Diameter, longest path and circumference of a complex component. The large vertices like ◯ are the *corner* vertices.

Proof of Theorem 3. Recall that a *2-path* is a path connecting two corner vertices inside a complex component, see Figure 4. In Lemma 6 we prove that the length of a randomly uniformly chosen 2-path is $\Theta(n^{1/3})$ in probability.

From Lemma 9 we obtain that the maximum height of sprouting tree is also $\Theta(n^{1/3})$ in probability and since the total excess is bounded in probability as μ stays bounded, we can combine these two results to obtain the statement of the theorem, because all the three parameters come from adding/stitching several 2-paths and tree heights.

□

3 Lower Bound for SAT Probability

Consider a random graph $G_{2n,m,\Delta}$ from $\mathcal{G}_{2n,m,\Delta}$. Instead of labeling the vertices with natural numbers from 1 to $2n$, they can be labeled by $\{1,2,\ldots,n,\overline{1},\overline{2},\ldots,\overline{n}\}$. It is possible to orient its m edges in 2^m possible ways to obtain a random directed graph (*initial digraph*). Then we can create a copy of this graph, replacing literals $x_i, \overline{x}_i$ by their negations $\overline{x}_i, x_i$ and changing the direction of each edge. Next, we combine these two digraphs into a single digraph, joining the sets of their edges.

The resulting graph is a digraph representation of some 2-CNF formula. We say that the initial digraph is one of the possible *sum-representations* of the formula, see Figure 5.



Figure 5: Digraph representation and sum-representation of a 2-SAT formula $(\overline{x}_1 \vee \overline{x}_2)(x_2 \vee x_3)(x_2 \vee \overline{x}_1)(\overline{x}_4 \vee \overline{x}_3)(\overline{x}_4 \vee x_2)(\overline{x}_4 \vee \overline{x}_4)$.

Each clause $(x_i \vee x_i)$ or $(\overline{x}_i \vee \overline{x}_i)$ results in a so-called *double-edge*, like $(\overline{x}_4 \vee \overline{x}_4)$ in Figure 5. If the graph is chosen uniformly at random, then the resulting formula is not uniform. In the standard 2-SAT model all the clauses consist of *strictly distinct* literals, which means that in each clause $x \vee y$ neither $x = y$ nor $x = \overline{y}$. However, in the case of $\Delta = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, it is known that the number of double edges is distributed according to some Poisson distribution, therefore 2-SAT with double edges falls into the classical framework with positive probability. In our model, all the SAT-formulas with strictly distinct clauses are equiprobable.

Theorem 4. *Let $m = \alpha n(1 + \mu n^{-1/3})$, $|\mu| = O(n^{1/12})$. A random 2-SAT formula $F_{n,m,\Delta}$ from the model defined above, having n literals and m clauses, and whose literal degrees belong to a set Δ, is satisfiable with probability*

1. $\mathbb{P}(F_{n,m,\Delta}$ *is* SAT$) \geq 1 - O(|\mu|^{-3})$ *as* $\mu \to -\infty$,
2. $\mathbb{P}(F_{n,m,\Delta}$ *is* SAT$) \geq \Theta(1)$ *as* $|\mu| = O(1)$,
3. $\mathbb{P}(F_{n,m,\Delta}$ *is* SAT$) \geq \exp(-\Theta(\mu^3))$ *as* $\mu \to +\infty$.

The constant inside $O(|\mu|^{-3})$ is the same as in Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 4. It is well known that a formula is UNSAT if and only if there exists a *contradictory circuit* in its digraph representation, i.e. there exists literal x such that $x \rightsquigarrow \overline{x}$ and $\overline{x} \rightsquigarrow x$ (see for instance [BBC+01]). This probability can be bounded by n times the probability that $1 \rightsquigarrow \overline{1}$ and $\overline{1} \rightsquigarrow 1$. If there is a contradictory circuit, then there is at least one sum-representation G having a circuit inside.



Figure 6: Part of a random 2-CNF containing a circuit with literals 1 and $\overline{1}$.

Suppose that the shortest circuit connecting 1 and $\overline{1}$ inside G has length ℓ. For each clause which doesn't form double edge there exist two possible choices of an edge which represents this clause in the sum-representation. Thus, for each digraph G, there is at most 2^ℓ possible digraphs, which satisfy two conditions: they are sum-representations of the same CNF as G and don't have circuit connecting 1 and $\overline{1}$.

The probability that formula is UNSAT, can be bounded by the proportion of sum-representations which are either graphs with non-empty complex parts or 2^ℓ times graphs with circuits of length ℓ

containing 1 and $\overline{1}$ on this circuit.

$$\mathbb{P}(F_{n,m,\Delta} \text{ is UNSAT}) \leq p_0(n,m,\Delta) n\mathbb{E}(2^L) + \sum_{q\geq 1} p_q(n,m,\Delta) \ , \tag{13}$$

where $p_q(n,m,\Delta)$ denotes the probability that the complex part a random graph from $\mathcal{G}_{n,m,\Delta}$ has total excess q and L is a random variable defined as follows:

$$L = \begin{cases} -\infty, & \text{if } 1, \overline{1} \notin \text{circuit in } G, \\ \ell, & \text{if } 1, \overline{1} \in \text{circuit of shortest length } \ell \text{ in } G\,. \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

The value $n\mathbb{E}(2^L)$ is obtained by saddle-point methods in Lemma 11, and has asymptotics $\Theta(\mu^{-2}n^{-1/3})$. The behaviour of $A_\Delta(y,\mu)$ defined in Corollary 2 dictates an upper bound on the probability of UNSAT. □

4 Experiments



(a) Probability of largest excess. (b) Largest component size. (c) Graph diameter.

Figure 7: Results of experiments.

We considered random graphs with $n = 1000$ vertices, and various degree constraints. The random generation procedure of such graphs was explained by de Panafieu and Ramos in [dPR16] and for our experiments, we implemented the *recursive method*. We note that this kind of sampling is not *exact* in the sense that the probability of obtaining a simple graph is uniform only in asymptotics.

The generator first draws a sequence of degrees and then performs a random pairing on half-edges, as in configuration model [Bol80]. We reject the pairing until the multigraph is simple, i.e. until there are no loops and multiple edges. As $|\mu| = O(1)$, expected number of rejections is asymptotically $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\phi_1(\widehat{z}) - \frac{1}{4}\phi_1^2(\widehat{z})\right)$, which is $\exp(-3/4)$ in the critical window, and in the subcritical phase it is less.

4.1 Recursive sampler

Each sequence $(d_1, \ldots, d_n)$ is drawn with weight $\prod_{v=1}^n 1/(d_v)!$. First, we use dynamic programming to precompute the sums of the weights $(S_{i,j})\colon i \in [0,n], j \in [0,2m]$ using initial conditions and the recursive expression:

$$S_{i,j} = \sum_{\substack{d_1+\ldots+d_i=j \\ d_1,\ldots,d_i\in\Delta}} \prod_{v=1}^{i} \frac{1}{d_v!} \ , \quad S_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1, & (i,j) = (0,0) \ , \\ 0, & i = 0 \text{ or } j < 0 \ , \\ \sum\limits_{d\in\Delta} \dfrac{S_{i-1,j-d}}{d!}, & \text{otherwise} \ . \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

Then the sequence of degrees is generated according to the distribution

$$\mathbb{P}(d_n = d) = \frac{S_{n-1,2m-d}}{d! S_{n,2m}} \ . \tag{16}$$

We obtained distributions for excess of a connected component, largest component size and largest diameter of the component for $\Delta = \{1,3,5,7\}$. See Figure 7.

4.2 Boltzmann sampler

Boltzmann sampler was introduced in the seminal article by Duchon, Flajolet, Louchard, and Schaeffer ([DFLS04]); it generates graphs with approximate number of edges, but faster then other generators. In the case of graphs with degree constraints, the algorithm draws independently n integers $(d_1, \dots, d_n)$ according to the law

$$\mathbb{P}(d) = \begin{cases} 0, & d \notin \Delta; \\ \dfrac{z^d}{d!\omega(z)}, & d \in \Delta, \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

rejects if the sum is odd, and outputs a sequence of edges $(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$.

5 Conclusion

We studied how to shift the phase transition of random graphs when the degrees of the nodes are constrained by means of analytic combinatorics [dPR16, FS09].

We have shown that the planarity threshold of those constrained graphs can be shifted generalizing the results in [NRR15].

We have also shown that when our random constrained graphs are inside their critical window of transition, the size of complex components are typically of order $n^{2/3}$ and all distances inside the complex components are of order $n^{1/3}$, thus our results about these parameters complement those of Nachmias and Peres in [NP08].

In addition, we studied random 2-CNF formula with constrained literal degrees. Our results show that if the literal degrees belong to some set Δ then with high probability a random formula with $m > n$ clauses are still SAT. In this direction, our approaches are different from the existing ones [CFS07, BBC+01] and give new insights to random Constraint Satisfaction Problems.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Fedor Petrov for his help in the proof of Lemma 5, and Élie de Panafieu for his valuable remarks on the current paper. We would like to thank the community `mathoverflow` for possibility of discussing science on-line, and the community of developers `ipython`, `scipy` for great open-source tools for scientific computations.

References

[BBC+01] Béla Bollobás, Christian Borgs, Jennifer Chayes, Jeong Han Kim, and David Wilson. The scaling window of 2-SAT transition. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 18:201 – 256, 2001.

[BF01] Tom Bohman and Alan Freize. Avoiding a giant component. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 19(1):75–85, 2001.

[BLL98] F. Bergeron, G. Labelle, and P. Leroux. *Combinatorial Species and Tree-like Structures*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.

[Bol80] Béla Bollobás. A probabilistic proof of an asymptotic formula for the number of labelled regular graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 1:311–316, 1980.

[Bol85] Béla Bollobás. *Random graphs*. Academic Press, Inc., London, 1985.

[CFS07] Colin Cooper, Alan Frieze, and Gregory B. Sorkin. Random 2-SAT with Prescribed Literal Degrees. *Algorithmica*, 48:249 — 265, 2007.

[DFLS04] Philippe Duchon, Philippe Flajolet, Guy Louchard, and Gilles Schaeffer. Boltzmann samplers for the random generation of combinatorial structures. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, pages 577 – 625, 2004.

[dPR16] Élie de Panafieu and Lander Ramos. Enumeration of graphs with degree constraints. *Proceedings of the Meeting on Analytic Algorithmics and Combinatorics (ANALCO 2016)*, 2016.

[ER60] Paul Erdős and Alfred Rényi. On the evolution of random graphs. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Matematikai Kutató Intézetének Közleményei*, 5:17–61, 1960.

[FO82] Philippe Flajolet and Andrew M. Odlyzko. The average height of binary trees and other simple trees. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 25:171 – 213, 1982.

[FPK89] Philippe Flajolet, Boris Pittel, and Donald E. Knuth. The first cycles in an evolving graph. *Discrete Mathematics*, 75:167 – 215, 1989.

[FS09] Philippe Flajolet and Robert Sedgewick. *Analytic Combinatorics*. Cambridge Press, 2009.

[HM12] Hamed Hatami and Michael Molloy. The scaling window for a random graph with a given degree sequence. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 41(1):99–123, 2012.

[JKLP93] Svante Janson, Donald E. Knuth, Tomasz Łuczak, and Boris Pittel. The birth of the giant component. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 4(3):231–358, 1993.

[JPRRar] Felix Joos, Guillem Perarnau, Dieter Rautenbach, and Bruce Reed. How to determine if a random graph with a fixed degree sequence has a giant component. *Probability Theory and Related Fields (Extended Abstract in the Proc. of the IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (2016))*, To appear.

[KPS13] Mihyun Kang, Will Perkins, and Joel Spencer. The bohman-frieze process near criticality. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 43(2):221–250, 2013.

[MR95] R. Molloy and B. Reed. A critical point for random graphs with a given degree sequence. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 6:161 — 179, 1995.

[NP08] Asaf Nachmias and Yuval Peres. Critical random graphs: Diameter and mixing time. *The Annals of Probability*, 36(4):1267–1286, 2008.

[NRR15] Marc Noy, Vlady Ravelomanana, and Juanjo Rué. On the probability of planarity of a random graph near the critical point. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 143(3):925–936, 2015.

[Pet16] Fedor Petrov. Analytic combinatorics: upper bound for sum of absolute values of two complex functions: $|zf'(z)| + |2f(z) - z'(z)| \le 2f(|z|)$, 2016.

[PW13] Robin Pemantle and Mark C. Wilson. *Analytic Combinatorics in Several Variables*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 2013.

[RW12] Oliver Riordan and Lutz Warnke. Achlioptas process phase transitions are continuous. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 22(4):1450–1464, 2012.

A Saddle-point analysis

A.1 Symbolic tools

For each $r \ge 0$, let us define *r-sprouted trees*: rooted trees whose vertex degrees belong to the set Δ, except the root, whose degree belongs to the set $\Delta - \ell = \{\delta \ge 0 : \delta + \ell \in \Delta\}$. Their EGF $T_\ell(z)$ can be defined recursively

$$T_\ell(z) = z\omega^{(\ell)}(T_1(z)),\ T_1(z) = z\omega'(T_1(z)) \ , \quad \ell \ge 0 \ . \tag{18}$$

Lemma 1. *Let $U(z)$ be the* EGF *for unrooted trees and $V(z)$ the EGF of unicycles whose vertices have degrees $\in \Delta$. Then*

$$U(z) = T_0(z) - \frac{T_1(z)^2}{2} \ , \quad V(z) = \frac{1}{2}\left[\log\frac{1}{1-T_2(z)} - T_2(z) - \frac{T_2^2(z)}{2}\right] \ , \tag{19}$$

where $T_0(z)$, $T_1(z)$, and $T_2(z)$ are by (18).



Figure 8: Recursive construction of $T_0(z)$: the degree of the root of each subtree should belong to the set $\Delta - 1$.



Figure 9: Variant of dissymetry theorem for unrooted trees with degree constraints.

Remark 1. *The above statement for $U(z)$ can be computed using the dissymetry theorem for trees, adapted for the case with degree constraints (see [BLL98, Section 4.1], [FPK89]). The expression for $V(z)$ is an application of the symbolic method of EGFs in the case of undirected cycles (*$\mathrm{CYC}_{\ge 3}$*) of 2-sprouted trees.*

Any multigraph M on n labeled vertices can be defined by a symmetric $n \times n$ matrix of nonnegative integers m_{xy}, where $m_{xy} = m_{yx}$ is the number of edges $x - y$ in M. The compensation factor $\kappa(M)$ is defined by

$$\kappa(M) = 1 \Big/ \prod_{x=1}^{n} \left(2^{m_{xx}} \prod_{y=x}^{n} m_{xy}! \right) \ . \tag{20}$$



Figure 10: Unicycles with degree constraints.

A multigraph process is a sequence of $2m$ *independent random vertices* $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{2m})$, $v_k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, *and output multigraph with the set of vertices* $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ *and the set of edges* $\{\{v_{2i-1}, v_{2i}\} : 1 \le i \le m\}$. *The number of sequences that lead to the same multigraph* M *is exactly* $2^m m! \kappa(M)$.

Lemma 2. *Let* $\overline{\overline{M}}$ *be some 3-core multigraph with a vertex set* V, $|V| = n$, *having* μ *edges, and compensation factor* $\kappa(\overline{\overline{M}})$. *Let* μ_{xy} *be the number of edges between vertices* x *and* y *for* $1 \le x \le y \le n$. *The generating function for all graphs* G *that lead to* $\overline{\overline{M}}$ *under reduction is*

$$\frac{\kappa(\overline{\overline{M}}) \prod\limits_{v \in V} T_{\deg(v)}(z)}{n!} \cdot \frac{P(\overline{\overline{M}}, T_2(z))}{(1 - T_2(z))^{\mu}}; \; P(\overline{\overline{M}}, z) = \prod_{x=1}^{n} \Big(z^{2\mu_{xx}} \prod_{y=x+1}^{n} z^{\mu_{xy}-1} (\mu_{xy} - (\mu_{xy} - 1)z) \Big). \tag{21}$$



Figure 11: All possible 3-core multigraphs of excess 1 and their compensation factors. The first one has negligible contribution because it is non-cubic.

Corollary 1. *Assume that* $\phi_1(\widehat{z}) = 1$. *Near the singularity* $z \sim \widehat{z}$, *i.e.* $T_2(z) \approx 1$, *some of the summands from Lemma 2 are negligible. Dominant summands correspond to graphs* $\overline{\overline{M}}$ *with maximal number of edges, i.e. graphs with* $3r$ *edges and* $2r$ *vertices. The vertices of degree greater than* 3 *can be splitted into more vertices with additional edges. Due to [JKLP93, Section 7, Equation (7.2)], the sum of the compensation factors is expressed as*

$$e_{r0} = \frac{(6r)!}{2^{5r} 3^{2r} (3r)! (2r)!} \; . \tag{22}$$

and the sum of major summands is asymptotically

$$e_{r0} \frac{T_3(z)^{2r}}{(1 - T_2(z))^{3r}} \; . \tag{23}$$

Remark 2. *Let's give an example of application of Lemma 2, first in less technical multigraph form, then for simple graphs.*

Each multi-edge in the 3-core $\overline{\overline{M}}$ *corresponds to a sequence of trees in the initial graph* M. *Therefore, the generating function for multigraphs* M *which reduce to one of the three depicted (see Figure 11) 3-core multigraphs consists of 3 summands:*

$$W_{\Delta}(z) = \frac{1}{4} \frac{T_4(z)}{(1 - T_2(z))^2} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{T_3(z)^2}{(1 - T_2(z))^3} + \frac{1}{6} \frac{T_3(z)^2}{(1 - T_2(z))^3} \; . \tag{24}$$

We write $T_2(z)$ because if we attach a tree on any path, the degree of the root decreases by 2. For the same reason there appear $T_3(z)$ and $T_4(z)$. If we evaluate $W_\Delta(z)$ near the pole $z=\widehat{z}$, or equivalently at $T_2(z)=1$, the first summand goes to ∞ slower than the second and the third. This yields asymptotic approximation[1]

$$W_\Delta(z) = \frac{5}{24}\frac{T_3(z)^2}{(1-T_2(z))^3} + O\left(\frac{1}{(1-T_2(z))^2}\right) \tag{26}$$

With simple graphs (not multigraphs) the situation is similar. For the first core we want the path to be non-empty (because simple graphs don't contain loops), so the generating function is $\frac{1}{4}\frac{T_4(z)T_2(z)^4}{(1-T_2(z))^2}$. For the second graph we also require that both paths obtained from loops, contain at least one node inside: $\frac{1}{4}\frac{T_3(z)^2T_2(z)^4}{(1-T_2(z))^3}$. Then, for the third core, we need at least two of the paths contain at least one node. Collecting all the summands we obtain

$$\widetilde{W}_\Delta(z) = \frac{1}{4}\frac{T_4(z)T_2(z)^4}{(1-T_2(z))^2} + \frac{1}{4}\frac{T_3(z)^2T_2(z)^4}{(1-T_2(z))^3} + \frac{1}{6}\frac{T_3(z)^2[3T_2(z)^2-2T_2^3(z)]}{(1-T_2(z))^3} \ . \tag{27}$$

At z near $\widehat{z}$, $T_2(z)=1$, so the asymptotics of this term is again

$$\widetilde{W}_\Delta(z) = \frac{5}{24}\frac{T_3(\widehat{z})^2}{(1-T_2(z))^3} + O\left(\frac{1}{(1-T_2(z))^2}\right) \ . \tag{28}$$

In the similar manner as was done in [JKLP93, Lemma 2, Equation (9.21)], we can prove that the dominant summand in the case of simple graphs and multigraphs is the same and equals the total compensation factor of cubic kernels e_{r0} times the generating function $\frac{T_3(z)^{\#nodes}}{(1-T_2(z))^{\#edges}}$. We omit the factor $T_2(z)^{\#edges}$ because it is equal to 1 (as $z=\widehat{z}$).

Proof of Lemma 2. The proof is similar to [JKLP93, Lemma 2]. We need to count the junctions of different degrees. All the paths contain vertices of degree at least 2, so we plug $T_2(z)$ into $P(\overline{\overline{M}}, z)$. □

Proof of Corollary 1. (From [Bol85, Chapter 2]) In a cubic multigraph each vertex has 3 half-edges that need to be paired, there are $6r$ half-edges in total. The number of such pairings is $(6r)!/\left((3r)!2^{3r}\right)$. In each vertex the three half-edges can be permuted in $3!=6$ ways, so we divide by 6^{2r} to obtain finally that

$$\text{the number of cubic multigraphs} = \frac{(6r)!}{(3r)!2^{3r}6^{2r}} \ . \tag{29}$$

The multiple $(2r)!$ appears because the graph has $2r$ vertices and we deal with exponential generating functions. □

A.2 Analytic tools

Remark 3. *The crucial tool that we use in our work is the analytic lemma, Lemma 3, or equivalently, Corollary 2. Since the statements are quite cubersome, we propose an alternative way to understand the statements, by dividing the quantities involved into this theorem.*

Suppose that $|\mu| = O(1)$, and $n\to\infty$. We treat $A_\Delta(y,\mu)$ as a nearly constant number, while for the asymptotics the important factor is $n^{y/3-1/2}$ with $y=3r+1/2$. The left-hand side of Equation (33) expresses the probability of graph having complex component of excess r, provided that we specify the function Ψ correctly according to our combinatorial specification.

When we increase the excess r by 1, the exponential index of $n^{y/3-1/2}$ increases by 1, and the expression is multiplied by n. This is exactly the combinatorial interpretation that we are looking for: the generating

[1] the big-O notation with the generating functions means:

$$F(z) = O(B(z)) \text{ if } [z^n]F(z) \le c[z^n]B(z) \tag{25}$$

for sufficiently large n, so from Equation (26) we know that $[z^n]W_\Delta(z) \sim [z^n]\frac{5}{24}\frac{T_3(z)^2}{(1-T_2(z))^3}$.

functions of graphs which reduce to kernels that are non-cubic, have a negligible contribution into the total probability.

In order to count the number of graphs with complex component of excess r, we note that the total number of trees should compensate the total excess to $m-n$, so the number of trees is $n-m+r$. When we substitute this into Corollary 2, additional multiple n caused by extra excess, cancels with $(n-m+r)!$ in the denominator. This explains why for any fixed collection of excesses of complex components $q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k$ the probability of having a graph with such an excess, is asymptotically a constant. A rigorous calculation of this probability involves substituting the asymptotics of $|\mathcal{G}_{n,m,\Delta}|$ obtained in [dPR16].

Lemma 3. *Let $m = rn = \alpha n(1+\mu\nu)$, where $\nu = n^{-1/3}$, $|\mu| = O(n^{1/12})$, $n \to \infty$, and $\widehat{z}$ be a unique real positive solution of $\phi_1(\widehat{z}) = 1$. Let $C_2 = \dfrac{t_3\alpha\widehat{z}}{2(1-\alpha)}$, $C_3 = \dfrac{2t_3\alpha\widehat{z}}{3}$, $t_3 = \dfrac{\widehat{z}\omega'''(\widehat{z})}{\omega'(\widehat{z})}$. Then for any function $\tau(z)$ analytic in $|z| \le \widehat{z}$ the contour integral encircling complex zero, admits asymptotic representation*

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint (1-\phi_1(z))^{1-y} e^{nh(z;r)}\tau(z)\frac{dz}{z} \sim \nu^{2-y}(zt_3)^{1-y}\tau(z)e^{nh(z;\alpha)} \times B_\Delta(y,\mu)\Big|_{z=\widehat{z}} \ , \tag{30}$$

$$B_\Delta(y,\mu) = \tfrac{1}{3}C_3^{\frac{y-2}{3}} \sum_{k\ge 0} \frac{\left(C_2 C_3^{-2/3}\mu\right)^k}{k!\Gamma\left(\frac{y+1-2k}{3}\right)},\ h(z;r) = \log\omega' - r\log z + (1-r)\log(2\frac{\omega}{\omega'} - z).$$

Remark 4. *In order to compute the probability in Corollary 2, we express the coefficient of a generating function as a contour integral. The methods for computing integrals of such kind are well-developed, for example, in [PW13]. In case of single root z_0 of the derivative $h_z(z;r)$ we approximate the integral with Gaussian density:*

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint g(z)e^{nh(z;r)}\frac{dt}{t} \sim \left(\frac{1}{2\pi n}\right)^{1/2} \frac{g(z_0)}{z_0\sqrt{h''(z_0)}} e^{nh(z_0)} \tag{31}$$

and in case of double root we approximate the integral of exponential of $(z-z_0)^3$.



Figure 12: Configuration of roots of $h_z(z;r)$.

Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint g(z)e^{nh(z;r)}\frac{dt}{t} \sim \frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint g(z)\exp\left(nh(z_0;r) + nh_z^{(3)}(z_0;r)\frac{(z-z_0)^3}{6}\right)\frac{dt}{t} \ . \tag{32}$$

Though these techniques are quite standard in a certain community, this machinery cannot be directly applied to the case of degree constraints because we need to prove that on the circle $z = z_0e^{i\theta}$, $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$ the maximum is attained at point $\theta = 0$, otherwise this method is not applicable.

As an illustration, we provide one of the pictures from our simulations: In this picture, the fact that the top red line is above the second-top brown line (we apologize for our assumption that colors can be accessed by the reader), reflects that the value at $\theta = 0$ is greater than the value at any other θ. This is the statement of Lemma 5. We are not confused by the fact that the red curve touches the brown curve several times, because this inequality is an intermediate step, and finally, the required inequality is strict at the end.



Figure 13: Real part of $h(z_0 e^{i\theta}; r)$ for some particular Δ.

Corollary 2. *If $m = \alpha n(1 + \mu n^{-1/3})$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $y \geq \frac{1}{2}$, then for any $\Psi(t)$ analytic at $t = 1$ we have*

$$\frac{n!}{(n-m)!|\mathcal{G}_{n,m,\Delta}|}[z^n]\frac{U(z)^{n-m}\Psi(T_2(z))}{(1-T_2(z))^y} = \sqrt{2\pi}\Psi(1)A_\Delta(y,\mu)n^{y/3-1/6} + O(R) \ , \tag{33}$$

$B_\Delta(y,\mu)$ is from Lemma 3 and the error term R is given by $R = (1+|\mu|^4)n^{y/3-1/2}$. This function $A_\Delta(y,\mu)$ can be expressed in terms of $A(y,\mu) = A_{\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}(y,\mu)$ introduced in [JKLP93]:

1. $A_\Delta(y,\mu) = (t_3\widehat{z})^{1-y}(3C_3)^{\frac{y-2}{3}}A\left(y, \frac{2C_2}{\sqrt[3]{(3C_3)^2}}\mu\right) = e^{-\mu^3/6}(\widehat{z}t_3)^{1-y}B_\Delta(y,\mu)$;
2. *As $\mu \to -\infty$, we have* $A(y,\mu) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}|\mu|^{y-1/2}}\left(1 - \frac{3y^2+3y-1}{6|\mu|^3} + O(\mu^{-6})\right)$;
3. *As $\mu \to +\infty$, we have* $A(y,\mu) = \frac{e^{-\mu^3/6}}{2^{y/2}\mu^{1-y/2}}\left(\frac{1}{\Gamma(y/2)} + \frac{4\mu^{-3/2}}{3\sqrt{2}\Gamma(y/2-3/2)} + O(\mu^{-2})\right)$.

Proof of Lemma 3 and Corollary 2. Let us prove the corollary first. We start with "Stirling" approximation part. In case of classical random graphs it would be enough to apply the Stirling approximation, but in the case of degree constraints we apply the asymptotic result of [dPR16]:

$$\frac{n!}{(n-m)!|\mathcal{F}_{n,m,\Delta}|} = \sqrt{2\pi n}\frac{z_0^{2m}\sqrt{2\alpha}}{p\cdot\omega(z_0)^n} \times \exp(n\log n + (n-m)\log(n-m) - m\log 2m)\times \\ \exp(\tfrac{1}{2}\phi_1(z_0) + \tfrac{1}{4}\phi_1^2(z_0))(1+O(n^{-1})) \ .$$

It happens that the exponential part of Stirling and some terms that will appear in Cauchy approximation, cancel out:

$$\exp\left(n\log n + (n-m)\log(n-m) - m\log 2m\right) = e^{-\mu^3/6} \times \frac{\omega(z_0)^n}{z_0^{2m}}2^{m-n}e^{nh(\widehat{z};\alpha)} \ . \tag{34}$$

Let us move to the Cauchy part for obtaining formal series coefficients. After "Lagrangian" variable change $T_1(z) \mapsto z$ we obtain:

$$[z^n]\frac{U(z)^{n-m}\Psi(T_2(z))}{(1-T_2(z))^y} = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint \frac{\Psi(T_2)U(z)^{n-m}dz}{(1-T_2(z))^y z^{n+1}} \\ = \frac{2^{m-n}}{2\pi i}\oint \Psi(\phi_1(z))(1-\phi_1(z))^{1-y}e^{nh(z;r)}\frac{dz}{z} \ . \tag{35}$$

The statement readily follows from Lemma 3.

Let us prove the lemma then. We start with specifying an integration contour, namely the circle $z = \widehat{z}e^{-s\nu}$ where $s = \beta + it$, $\beta > 0$, $t \in [-\pi n^{1/3}, \pi n^{1/3}]$. We need $\beta \to 0$ with $n \to \infty$. Technically, for correct error estimate, β can be chosen from

$$\mu = \beta^{-1} - \beta \ , \tag{36}$$

as suggested by [JKLP93]. We need to switch to contour $t \in (-\infty, +\infty)$ with the price of exponentially small error $O(e^{-\max(2,|\mu|)n^{1/6}/3})$, we omit the details of this approximation since they are already considered in the mentioned article.

Next, there will be two variable changes. The first change of variables is $z = \widehat{z}e^{-s\nu}$. We use an approximation for $nh(z;r)$ near the double saddle $\widehat{z}$ and critical ratio α. From Lemma 5 it follows that maximum value of $|e^{nh(z,r)}|$ for $t \in [-\pi n^{1/3}, \pi n^{1/3}]$ is attained for $t = 0$ (and also at the points $\frac{2\pi ik}{d}\nu$ where d is a period of Δ, but we can assume without loss of generality that $d = 1$, because otherwise, extra terms cancel out when we count the probability, since the denominator is given by expression from [dPR16]). Thus, we can choose a small $t_0 > 0$, such that $nh''(\widehat{z})(\nu t_0)^2 \to \infty$, $nh'''(\widehat{z})(\nu t_0)^3 \to 0$, and the absolute value of integral for $|t| > t_0$ is negligible.

Since there is a relation $r = \alpha(1+\mu\nu)$, we can use a Taylor expansion for $h(z,r)$ for z around $\widehat{z}$, which is uniform with respect to $(\alpha - r)$:

$$h(z;r) = \sum_{k=0}^{3} \frac{h_z^{(k)}(\widehat{z};r)(z-\widehat{z})^k}{k!} + O\left((s\nu)^4\right) \ . \tag{37}$$

The first derivative turns to zero, the second and the third can be written as

$$h''(\widehat{z},r) = \frac{(\phi_0(\widehat{z}) - 2r)\phi_1'(\widehat{z})}{\widehat{z}(\phi_0(\widehat{z}) - 2)} = \frac{t_3(\alpha - r)}{\widehat{z}(\alpha - 1)} \ , \tag{38}$$

$$h'''(\widehat{z},r) = \frac{\phi_0'(\widehat{z})\phi_1'(\widehat{z})}{\widehat{z}(\alpha - 1)} + O(\mu\nu) \sim -\frac{4t_3\alpha}{\widehat{z}^2} \ , \tag{39}$$

hence the final approximation takes the form

$$nh(z;r) = nh(\widehat{z};\alpha) + C_2\mu s^2 + C_3 s^3 + O\left((\mu^2 s^2 + s^4)\nu\right), \tag{40}$$

where $C_2 = h''(\widehat{z};\alpha)\widehat{z}^2/2$ and $C_3 = -h'''(\widehat{z};\alpha)\widehat{z}^3/6$ are given in the formulation. We also have

$$(1 - \phi_1(z))^{1-y} = s^{1-y}\nu^{1-y}(1 + O(s\nu)) \ ,$$

so when $s = O(n^{1/12})$, the integrand can be approximated

$$(1 - \phi_1(z))^{1-y} e^{nh(z,r)} = \nu^{1-y} s^{1-y} e^{nh(\widehat{z};\alpha)} \times e^{C_2\mu s^2 + C_3 s^3}(1 + O(s\nu) + O(\mu^2 s^2 \nu) + O(s^4\nu)) \ , \tag{41}$$

therefore

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint (1 - \phi_1(z))^{1-y} e^{nh(z;r)}\tau(z)\frac{dz}{z} =$$
$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}(\nu\widehat{z}\phi_1'(\widehat{z}))^{1-y}\tau(\widehat{z})e^{nh(\widehat{z})} \times \oint s^{1-y} e^{C_2\mu s^2 + C_3 s^3} \cdot (-\nu) ds \ . \tag{42}$$

Then we perform a second change of variable $s = u^{1/3}C_3^{-1/3}$. We need to be careful with the contour of integration: note that the integral doesn't change if we take instead of $t \in [-\infty, +\infty]$ any path $\Pi(\beta), \beta > 0$ given by

$$s(t) = \begin{cases} -e^{-\pi i/3}t, & -\infty < t \le 2\beta; \\ \beta + it\sin\pi/3, & -2\beta \le t \le 2\beta; \\ e^{\pi i/3}t, & 2\beta \le t < +\infty. \end{cases} \tag{43}$$

After variable transform we obtain Hankel contour Γ extending from $-\infty$, circling the origin counterclockwise, and returning to $-\infty$, and $ds = \frac{1}{3}(C_3u^2)^{-1/3}du$.

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Pi(\beta)} = \nu^{2-y}(\widehat{z}\phi_1'(\widehat{z}))^{1-y}\tau(\widehat{z})e^{nh(\widehat{z};\alpha)}C_3^{-y/3}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_\Gamma u^{y/3}e^u e^{C_2\mu u^{2/3}C_3^{-2/3}}du \cdot \tfrac{1}{3}C_3^{-1/3} \ .$$

Expanding the exponent

$$e^{C_2 C_3^{-2/3}\mu u^{2/3}} = \sum_{k\geq 0} (C_2 C_3^{-2/3}\mu u^{2/3})^k/k! \tag{44}$$

and applying the formula for inverse Gamma function on approximate Hankel contour we obtain the final statement. □

Lemma 4. *Assume that $m = rn$. The coefficient at z^n of an* EGF *for graphs from $\mathcal{F}_{n,m,\Delta}$ given by an equation*

$$[z^n]\frac{U(z)^{n-m+q}}{(n-m+q)!}e^{V(z)}E_{\mathbf{q}}(z) \ , \tag{45}$$

can be expressed as

$$\frac{2^{m-n}}{2\pi i(n-m+q)!}\oint e^{nh(z;r)}g(z)\tau(z)\frac{dz}{z} \ , \tag{46}$$

where the contour contains 0, the functions $h(z;r)$, $g(z)$ are given by

$$h(z;r) = r\log\omega'(z) - r\log z + (1-r)\log(2\omega - z\omega'), \tag{47}$$

$$g(z) = (1-\phi_1(z))^{1-y} \ , \ \ y = 3q + \tfrac{1}{2} \tag{48}$$

and $\tau(z)$ doesn't have singularities in $|z| \leq \widehat{z}$.

Proof. We can do a variable change $T_1(z) = t \mapsto z$. From the equation $T_1(z) = z\omega'(T_1(z))$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
z &= t\omega'(t)^{-1} \mapsto z\omega'(z)^{-1}, && (49)\\
dz &= (\omega')^{-1}(1-\phi_1)dt, && (50)\\
T_\ell &= z\omega^{(\ell)}(t) = t\omega^{(\ell)}(t)\omega'(t)^{-1}, && (51)\\
T_2(z) &\mapsto \phi_1(z) \ , && (52)\\
U(z)^{n-m} &\mapsto 2^{m-n}z^{n-m}(2\omega(\omega')^{-1} - z)^{n-m} && (53)
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we separate out the singular part:

$$U(z)^q e^{V(z)}E_{\mathbf{q}}(z)\frac{dz}{z} = \underbrace{(1-T_2(z))(\omega')^{-1}}_{dz/dt}\underbrace{\omega'(t)t^{-1}}_{z^{-1}} \tag{54}$$

$$\times \underbrace{U(z)^q\sqrt{1-T_2(z)}e^{V(z)}}_{\tau_1(z)}\underbrace{(1-T_2(z))^{3q}E_{\mathbf{q}}(z)}_{\tau_2(z)} \tag{55}$$

$$\times\frac{1}{(1-T_2(z))^{3q}}\cdot\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-T_2(z)}}dt \mapsto \tau(z)g(z) \ , \tag{56}$$

and the exponential one:

$$U(z)^{n-m}z^{-n} \mapsto 2^{m-n}\left(2\frac{\omega}{\omega'} - z\right)^{n-m} z^{n-m}\left(\frac{\omega'}{z}\right)^n = 2^{m-n}e^{nh(z;r)} \ . \tag{57}$$

□

In this section we mainly establish some asymptotic properties of $h(z;r)$ around $z = \widehat{z}$ and $r = r_0 = \alpha$. Its behaviour is important for saddle-point techniques. At arbitrary point $r = \alpha(1+\mu n^{-1/3})$ its derivative factors as

$$h'_z(z;r) = \frac{(\phi_0(z) - 2r)(\phi_1(z) - 1)}{z(\phi_0(z) - 2)} \ , \tag{58}$$

and the dominant complex root of $h'_z(z;r)$ (closest to zero) is a positive real number which is either the solution of $\phi_0(z) = 2r$ or the solution of $\phi_1(z) = 1$. Each of the equations has unique real positive solution which we denote by $\mathrm{Root}_1(r)$ and $\mathrm{Root}_2 = \widehat{z}$.

Lemma 5. *Let $z_0 > 0$, $z_0 \le \min(\mathrm{Root}_1(r), \mathrm{Root}_2)$, the periodicity of Δ is p. Then the function*

$$\Phi(\theta; r) = \mathrm{Re}\; h(z_0 e^{i\theta}; r) \tag{59}$$

attains its global maximums for $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ at p points $\theta_k = \frac{2\pi k}{p}$, $k = 0, 1, \ldots, p-1$.

Proof. Denote $z_0 e^{i\theta}$ by z. Without loss of generality we will treat the case of aperiodic $\omega(z)$, since any p-periodic function $\pi(z)$ can be reduced to an aperiodic one $\varphi(z)$ by a variable change $\pi(z) = z^\ell \varphi(z^p)$. $\Phi(\theta; r)$ can be rewritten as

$$\Phi(\theta; r) = r \log |\omega'(z)| + (1-r) \log |2\omega - z\omega'| + C \ . \tag{60}$$

We apply a version of Gibbs inequality for Kullback-Leibler divergence, also known as cross-entropy inequality: if p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2 are positive real numbers and $q_1 + q_2 \le p_1 + p_2$ then

$$p_1 \log \frac{p_1}{q_1} + p_2 \log \frac{p_2}{q_2} \ge 0 \ . \tag{61}$$

It is now sufficient to prove that

$$r \cdot \left| \frac{\omega'(z)}{\omega'(z_0)} \right| + (1-r) \cdot \left| \frac{2\omega(z) - z\omega'(z)}{2\omega(z_0) - z_0\omega'(z_0)} \right| \le 1 \ . \tag{62}$$

Note that $\phi_0(z_0) \le 2r$. We first prove the inequality for $\widetilde{r} = \frac{1}{2}\phi_0(z_0)$. Since the function $\omega'(z)$ has non-negative coefficients, we always have $|\omega'(z)/\omega'(z_0)| \le 1$, therefore if r increases, the inequality still remains true, thus for all $r \ge \widetilde{r}$ it is also true.

Substituting $\phi_0(z_0) = z_0\omega'(z_0)\omega(z_0)^{-1} = 2r$ we arrive to more simple inequality

$$|z\omega'(z)| + |2\omega(z) - z\omega'(z)| \le 2\omega(z_0) \ , \quad z_0 \le \alpha \ . \tag{63}$$

This inequality was proven by joint effort with Fedor Petrov at mathoverflow [Pet16] using a beautiful geometric statement.

Let $\gamma > \beta > 0$ and $1/\beta - 1/\gamma \ge 2$, then for any vector z with $|z| = 1$

$$|1 + \gamma z| + |1 - \beta z| \le 2 + \gamma - \beta \ . \tag{64}$$

Let us denote $z = e^{it}$. Differentiating the expression by θ and finding the zeros, we obtain

$$\frac{-2\gamma \sin\theta}{|1+\gamma z|} + \frac{2\beta \sin\theta}{|1+\beta z|} = 0 \ , \tag{65}$$

which is equivalent to

$$|z + 1/\gamma| = |z - 1/\beta| \ , \tag{66}$$

but the middle point of the segment $[-1/\gamma, 1/\beta]$ has value greater than or equal to 1 provided that $1/\beta - 1/\gamma \ge 2$, so the perpendicular bisector to this segment doesn't contain non-real points. The geometric statement in now proven.

Let $\omega(z) = \sum_{k\ge 0} c_k z^k$. Since $\phi_1(\widehat{z}) = 1$ and $0 < |z| \le \widehat{z}$, the inequality $\phi_1(z) \le 1$ can be expanded as

$$c_1 \ge \sum_{k\ge 2} (k^2 - 1) c_{k+1} |z|^k \ , \tag{67}$$

and we need to prove (63), which is equivalent to

$$\left| \sum_{k\ge 1} k c_k z^k \right| + |2c_0 + c_1 z - c_3 z^3 - 2c_4 z^4 - \ldots| \le 2c_0 + 2c_1|z| + 2c_2|z|^2 + \ldots \tag{68}$$

This is reduced by applying triangle inequality for removing terms with c_0 and c_2 and dividing by $|z|$:

$$|c_1 + 3c_3 z^3 + \ldots| + |c_1 - c_3 z^2 - 2c_4 z^3 - \ldots| \le 2c_1 + 2c_3|z|^2 + \ldots \tag{69}$$

Repeatedly using triangle inequalities, the above can be reduced to a family of inequalities

$$|(k^2-1)|z|^k + (k+1)z^k| + |(k^2-1)|z|^k - (k-1)z^k| \le (2(k^2-1) + 2)|z|^k \ , \tag{70}$$

which is a partial case of the geometric statement with $\gamma = \frac{1}{k-1}$, $\beta = \frac{1}{k+1}$. □

B Method of moments

In order to study the parameters of random structures, we apply the marking procedure introduced in [FS09]. We say that the variable u marks the parameter of random structure in bivariate EGF $F(z,u)$ if $n![z^n u^k]F(z,u)$ is equal to number of structures of size n and parameter equal to k. In this section we consider such parameters of a random graph as the length of 2-path, which corresponds to some edge of the 3-core, and the height of random "sprouting" tree. If we treat the parameter as a random variable X_n then the factorial moments can be calculated through an expression

$$\mathbb{E}X_n(X_n-1)\dots(X_n-k+1) = \frac{\dfrac{d^k}{du^k}F(z,u)\Big|_{u=1}}{F(z,1)} \ . \tag{71}$$

Recall that the number of graphs having n vertices, m edges, and fixed excess vector $\mathbf{q}=(q_1,q_2,\dots)$, can be expressed as n-th coefficient of the generating function

$$\frac{U(z)^{n-m+q}}{(n-m+q)!}e^{V(z)}E_{\mathbf{q}}(z) \ , \tag{72}$$

where $E_{\mathbf{q}}(z)=\prod_{j=1}^{k}\frac{(E_j(z))^{q_j}}{q_j!}$, $q=\sum_{j=1}^{k}jq_j$. This EGF can be modified to count the moments of random variable X_n.

B.1 Length of a random 2-path



Figure 14: Marked 2-path inside complex component of some graph

Let us fix the excess vector $\mathbf{q}=(q_1,q_2,\dots,q_k)$. There are in total $q=q_1+2q_2+\dots+kq_k$ connected complex components and each component has one of the finite possible number of 3-cores (see [JKLP93]). We can choose any 2-path, which is a sequence of trees, and replace it with of sequence of marked trees. Let random variable P_n be the length of this 2-path. Since an EGF for sequence of trees is $\frac{1}{1-T_2(z)}$, the corresponding moment-generating function $\mathbb{E}[u^{P_n}]$ becomes

$$\mathbb{E}[u^{P_n}] = \frac{n![z^n]\dfrac{U(z)^{n-m+q}}{(n-m+q)!}e^{V(z)}E_{\mathbf{q}}(z)\dfrac{1-T_2(z)}{1-uT_2(z)}}{n![z^n]\dfrac{U(z)^{n-m+q}}{(n-m+q)!}e^{V(z)}E_{\mathbf{q}}(z)} \ . \tag{73}$$

Lemma 6. *Suppose that conditions of Theorem 1 are satisfied. Suppose that there are q_j connected components of excess j for each j from 1 to k. Denote by* excess vector *a vector $\mathbf{q}=(q_1,q_2,\dots,q_k)$. Inside the critical window $m=\alpha n(1+\mu n^{-1/3})$, $|\mu|=O(1)$, the length P_n of a random (uniformly chosen) 2-path is $\Theta(n^{1/3})$ in probability, i.e.*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(P_n \notin n^{1/3}t_3(B_1 \pm \lambda B_2)\right) \le \frac{1}{(\lambda+o(1))^2} \ , \tag{74}$$

$t_3=\widehat{z}\dfrac{\omega'''(\widehat{z})}{\omega'(\widehat{z})}$, $B_1=\dfrac{B_\Delta(3q+\frac{3}{2},\mu)}{B_\Delta(3q+\frac{1}{2},\mu)}$, $B_2^2=\dfrac{B_\Delta(3q+\frac{5}{2},\mu)B_\Delta(3q+\frac{1}{2},\mu)-B_\Delta^2(3q+\frac{3}{2},\mu)}{B_\Delta^2(3q+\frac{1}{2},\mu)}$, *with function $B_\Delta(y,\mu)$ from Lemma 3, $q=q_1+2q_2+\dots+kq_k$.*

Proof of Lemma 6. The statement of the lemma is just an application of Chebyshev's inequality to the first and the second moment. Essentially, we need to prove that

$$\mathbb{E}P_n \sim n^{1/3} t_3 \frac{B_\Delta(3q+\frac{3}{2},\mu)}{B_\Delta(3q+\frac{1}{2},\mu)} \ , \ \mathbb{E}P_n(P_n-1) \sim n^{2/3}\ 2\,t_3^2 \frac{B_\Delta(3q+\frac{5}{2},\mu)}{B_\Delta(3q+\frac{1}{2},\mu)} \ , \tag{75}$$

which is just a consequence of Lemma 3 and Equation (71). □

B.2 Height of a random sprouting tree

Let $\varkappa(z) = \omega'(z)$. Consider recursive definition for the generating function of simple trees whose height doesn't exceed h:

$$T^{[h+1]}(z) = z\varkappa(T^{[h]}(z)) \ , \ T^{[0]}(z) = 0 \ . \tag{76}$$

The framework of multivariate generating functions allows to mark height with a separate variable u so that the function

$$F(z,u) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^n}{n!} \sum_{h=0}^{n} A_n^{[h]} u^h \tag{77}$$

is the BGF for trees, where $A_n^{[h]}$ stands for the number of simple labelled rooted trees with n vertices, whose height equals h.

In the article [FO82] Flajolet and Odlyzko consider the following expressions:

$$H(z) = \frac{d}{du}F(z,u)\Big|_{u=1} \ , \ D_s(z) = \frac{d^s}{du^s}F(z,u)\Big|_{u=1} \ . \tag{78}$$

Generally speaking, $H(z) = D_1(z)$ is a particular case of $D_s(z)$, but their analytic behaviour is different for $s = 1$ and $s \geq 2$.

Lemma 7 ([FO82, pp. 42–50])**.** *The functions $H(z)$ and $D_s(z)$, $s \geq 2$ satisfy*

$$H(z) \sim \alpha \log \varepsilon(z) \ , \ D_s(z) \sim (\widehat{z})^{-1} s\Gamma(s)\zeta(s)\varepsilon^{-s+1}(z) \ , \tag{79}$$

$\alpha = 2\dfrac{\varkappa'(\widehat{z})}{\varkappa''(\widehat{z})}$, $\varepsilon(z) = \widehat{z}\left(1-\dfrac{z}{\rho}\right)^{1/2}\left(\dfrac{2\varkappa''(\widehat{z})}{\varkappa(\widehat{z})}\right)^{1/2}$, $\rho = \widehat{z}\varkappa^{-1}(\widehat{z}) = (\varkappa'(\widehat{z}))^{-1}$.

We don't represent their proof here, but would like to remark that it has great methodological impact. For our purposes we need the asymptotic equivalence $\sim$ only in the circle of analiticity $|z| < \rho$.

From local expansion at $z = \rho$ of $z = z(T_1)$ it is easy to show that

$$z = \rho - (T_1(z) - \widehat{z})^2 \left(\frac{\varkappa''(\widehat{z})\widehat{z}}{2\varkappa^2(\widehat{z})}\right) \tag{80}$$

and consequently, since $T_k(z) = z\varkappa^{(k)}(T_1(z))$,

$$T_1(z) = \widehat{z} - \sqrt{\frac{2\varkappa}{\varkappa''}}\sqrt{1-\frac{z}{\rho}} + O(1-z\rho^{-1}) \ , \ T_2(z) = 1 - \sqrt{\frac{2\widehat{z}\varkappa''}{\varkappa}}\sqrt{1-\frac{z}{\rho}} + O(1-z\rho^{-1}) \ . \tag{81}$$

So we have $\varepsilon(z) \sim \widehat{z}^{1/2}(1-T_2(z))$.

Actually, there are two kinds of sprouting trees that we have to distinguish: the first ones are attached to the vertices with degree from $\Delta-2$, and the second — to the vertices with degree from $\Delta-3$, we will treat these cases separately.

Now we can introduce random variables $H_{n(2)}, H_{n(3)}$ equal to the height of a randomly uniformly chosen sprouting tree (of the first and second type respectively), conditioned on excess number $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k)$, and their moment generating functions:

$$\mathbb{E}[H_{n(1)}] = \frac{[z^n]U(z)^{n-m+q}e^{V(z)}E_{\mathbf{q}}(z)\dfrac{F_{(2)}(z,u)}{T_2(z)}}{[z^n]U(z)^{n-m+q}e^{V(z)}E_{\mathbf{q}}(z)} \ , \tag{82}$$

$$\mathbb{E}[H_{n(2)}] = \frac{[z^n]U(z)^{n-m+q}e^{V(z)}E_{\mathbf{q}}(z)\dfrac{F_{(3)}(z,u)}{T_2(z)}}{[z^n]U(z)^{n-m+q}e^{V(z)}E_{\mathbf{q}}(z)} \ , \tag{83}$$

where $F_{(2)}(z,u)$ and $F_{(3)}(z,u)$ are the corresponding BGF for 2- and 3-sprouted trees.

Lemma 8. *Around $z=\rho$ the derivatives of $F_{(2)}$ and $F_{(3)}$ with respect to u at $u=1$ can be expressed as*

$$\left.\frac{d^s}{du^s}F_{(2)}(z,u)\right|_{u=1} \underset{z=\rho}{\sim} \frac{\varkappa'(\widehat{z})}{\varkappa''(\widehat{z})}\left.\frac{d^s}{du^s}F(z,u)\right|_{u=1}, \tag{84}$$

$$\left.\frac{d^s}{du^s}F_{(3)}(z,u)\right|_{u=1} \underset{z=\rho}{\sim} \frac{\varkappa'(\widehat{z})}{\varkappa'''(\widehat{z})}\left.\frac{d^s}{du^s}F(z,u)\right|_{u=1} . \tag{85}$$

Proof. We only present the main idea of the proof, omitting the technical details of how the error term is treated — we refer to [FO82] for the details of transfer theorems and sum approximations.

Consider more general specification, where root degree can belong to the set Φ whose EGF is given by $\varphi(z)=\sum_{d\in\Phi}(d!)^{-1}$. As said before, let $T^{[h]}(z)$ be an EGF for trees of height $\le h$ given by Equation (76). Then the EGF $T_\Phi^{[h]}(z)$for rooted trees, whose root belongs to Φ with height bounded by h, can be written as

$$T_\Phi^{[h+1]} = z\varphi(T_1^{[h]}(z)) \ , \ \ T_\Phi[0](z)=0 \ . \tag{86}$$

Then, there is a second-order Taylor expansion

$$T_\Phi(z)-T_\Phi^{[h+1]}(z) = z(T_1(z)-T_1^{[h]}(z))\varphi'(T_1(z))\times \tag{87}$$

$$\left[1-(T_1-T_1^{[h]})\frac{\varphi''(T_1)}{2\varphi'(T_1)}+O\left((T_1-T_1^{[h]})^2\right)\right] . \tag{88}$$

Denoting $T_1-T_1^{[h]}=e_h(z)$, $T_\Phi-T_\Phi^{[h]}=\widetilde{e}_h(z)$, we get approximate expansions

$$F(z,u)\sim uT_1(z)+(u-1)z\sum_{h\ge1}u^h e_h(z)\varkappa'(T_1) \ , \tag{89}$$

$$F_\Phi(z,u)\sim u\varphi(T_1(z))+(u-1)z\sum_{h\ge1}u^h e_h(z)\varphi'(T_1) \ , \tag{90}$$

so in order to calculate the ratio of derivatives with respect to u at the vicinity of $z=\rho$ we note that the terms $\varkappa'(\widehat{z})$ and $\varphi'(\widehat{z})$ provide the ratio of the coefficients of main asymptotics. □

Lemma 9. *Inside the critical window $m=\alpha n(1+\mu n^{-1/3})$, $|\mu|=O(1)$, the maximal height H_n of a sprouting tree, is of $O(n^{1/3})$ in probability, i.e.*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max H_n > \lambda n^{1/3}\right) = O(\lambda^{-2}) \ . \tag{91}$$

Actually, the *average* height of a sprouting tree (if the tree is taken uniformly at random) appears to be $\Theta(\log n)$ (which seems to be a new result), but when we take the maximum over all possible $\Theta(n^{1/3})$ trees, and apply Chebyshev inequality, this factor disappears.

Proof of Lemma 9. We prove the statement for 2-sprouting trees (with root degree from $\Delta-2$), and for 3-sprouting trees the proof is the same up to a constant term.

The ratio of the expressions in the numerator and denominator can be treated in terms of Lemma 3. After "lagrangian" variable change $T_1(z)=t\mapsto z$ the ratio in $\mathbb{E}H_{n(1)}$ becomes proportional to

$$\frac{C_1\oint(1-\phi_1(z))^{1-y}e^{nh(z;r)}\log(1-\phi_1(z))dz/z}{C_2\oint(1-\phi_1(z))^{1-y}e^{nh(z;r)}dz/z} \tag{92}$$

with $y=3q+\frac{1}{2}$, and after the second variable change $z=\widehat{z}e^{-s\nu}$, $s=a+it$ the main asymptotics term will become

$$\left(C_1\oint(\cdots)\right)\Big/\left(C_2\oint(\cdots)\right)\sim\widetilde{C}_1(\mu)\log n \ , \tag{93}$$

For the second factorial moment we obtain

$$\widetilde{C}_2(\mu)n^{1/3} + O(1+|\mu|^4) \ , \tag{94}$$

so from Chebyshev inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|H_{n(1)} - \widetilde{C}_1 \log n| \geq \lambda C_2 n^{1/6}\right) \leq \frac{1}{(\lambda + o(1))^2} \ . \tag{95}$$

Since 2-path length is $\Theta(n^{1/3})$ in probability, we can control the maximal tree height:

$$\mathbb{P}(H_n \geq \lambda C_2 n^{1/3}) = O(\lambda^{-2} n^{-1/3}) \ , \ \ \mathbb{P}(\max H_n \geq \lambda C_2 n^{1/3}) = O(\lambda^{-2}) \ . \tag{96}$$

□

B.3 Circuits in directed graphs

Let's introduce EGF for directed rooted trees and directed unrooted trees:

$$\vec{T}_r(z) = \frac{1}{2} T_r(2z), \tag{97}$$

$$\vec{U}(z) = \frac{1}{2} T_0(2z) - \frac{1}{4} T_1^2(2z) \tag{98}$$

Then we introduce a EGF for so-calles *unicircuits*, which are directed graphs obtained from undirected unicycle graphs by directing edges, and having all edge directions of the cycle in the same direction (clockwise or couterclockwise). The EGF for circuits is the same as EGF for usual cycle operator:

$$\textsc{circuit}_{>2}(z) = \log \frac{1}{1-z} - z - \frac{z^2}{2} \tag{99}$$

and we can substitute directed unrooted trees to obtain unicircuit graphs.

In order to mark the length of the circuit, we put $z \mapsto uz$, where u is a new marking variable. Next, we mark two vertices on a circuit using a pointing operator $z\frac{d}{dz}$ and then substitute $z \mapsto \vec{T}_2(z)$.

$$\vec{V}^{\bullet}(z) = \vec{V}^{\bullet}(z,u)\Big|_{u=2} = \left[\left(z\frac{d}{dz}\right)\left(z\frac{d}{dz}\right)\textsc{circuit}_{>2}(uz)\right]\Bigg|_{z=\vec{T}_2(z),\ u=2} \ . \tag{100}$$

We would like to plug $u = 2$ because according to the method of moments, it corresponds to the expectation of 2^L where L is the random variable defined in Lemma 11. Finally, the expression is

$$\vec{V}^{\bullet}(z) = \left[\frac{T_2(2z)^2}{(1-T_2(2z))^2} + \frac{T_2(2z)}{1-T_2(2z)} - T_2(2z) - 2T_2(2z)^2\right] \ , \tag{101}$$

which is intuitively clear because the circuit with two marked cycles is just a pair of sequences (minus the case of two sequences of length 2 because it doesn't correspond to a simple graph).

Then we divide the final probability by $n(n-1)$ because this is the number of possibilities to choose two vertices. It can also be explained formally: when we work with *exponential* generating functions, the number of objects is equal to $n![z^n]f(z)$. Here, we mark two vertices with fixed numbers, which is the same as to say that these vertices have numbers n and $n-1$ and we want to count the number of objects of size $n-2$, so we extract the coefficient with formula $(n-2)![z^{n-2}]f(z) = \frac{1}{n(n-1)}[z^n]z^2 f(z)$. After applying saddle-point analysis to the function $z^2 f(z)$ we obtain the same result up to a constant multiple.

Lemma 10. *The expectation $\mathbb{E}(2^L)$ is equal to*

$$\frac{[z^n]\vec{U}(z)^{n-m}\exp(\vec{V}(z))\cdot\vec{V}^{\bullet}(z)}{[z^n]\vec{U}(z)^{n-m}\exp(\vec{V}(z))} = \frac{1}{n(n-1)}\left(\frac{\widehat{z}}{\omega'(\widehat{z})}\right)^2 \cdot \frac{\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint e^{nh(z;r)}g(z)\tau(z)\frac{dz}{z}}{\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint e^{nh(z;r)}g(z)\frac{dz}{z}} \ , \tag{102}$$

$h(z;r)$ is from Lemma 3, $g(z) \sim C_1\sqrt{1-z}$, $\tau(z) \sim \frac{C_2}{(1-z)^2}$.

Proof. We make a Lagrangian variable substitution $z \mapsto t = T_2(2z)$. Gathering the exponential part, we obtain (after cancelling 2^n) in numerator and denominator for simplicity, and also a constant multiple of $\vec{U}(z)$):

$$h(z;r) = \log \omega' - r \log z + (1-r)\log(2\frac{\omega}{\omega'} - z) \ , \tag{103}$$

which doesn't come as a surprise, because putting the directions on the edges doesn't change the point of phase transition. Additional multiple z^2 that we gain from the method of moments, is transformed into $\left(\frac{\widehat{z}}{\omega'(\widehat{z})}\right)^2$. □

Lemma 11. *Let $m = 2\alpha n(1+\mu n^{-1/3})$, x and y be some fixed literals, D is a random digraph constructed by the rules described in Section 3,*

$$L = \begin{cases} -\infty, & \text{if } x,y \notin \text{strongly connected component in } D, \\ \ell, & \text{if } x,y \in \text{circuit of length } \ell \text{ in } D. \end{cases} \tag{104}$$

Then $n\mathbb{E}(2^L) \sim n^{-1/3}\dfrac{A_\Delta(3q+2+\frac{1}{2},\mu)}{A_\Delta(3q+\frac{1}{2},\mu)}$, where $A_\Delta(y,\mu)$ is from Corollary 2.

Proof of Lemma 11. We apply Lemma 3 to an expression from Lemma 10 to obtain the final answer.

Note that in the subcritical phase, the final asymptotic bound for $n\mathbb{E}(2^L)$ is $\lesssim \dfrac{n \cdot n^{2/3}\mu^{-2}}{n(n-1)} = O(n^{-1/3}\mu^{-2})$. This is negligible compared to $\Theta(|\mu|^{-3})$ which arises in the probability that a random graph doesn't have complex part. This is the explanation why the constants at $O()$-big are the same in Theorem 1 and Theorem 4. □

C Degree sequence and degree constraints models

In this section, we give some insights about the two different models. Furthermore, we emphasize that the equation (2) for threshold point is expressed through exponential generating functions, and it's unlikely to obtain it using some other method. The analysis using generating function is usually more precise, and using our machinery we were able to track the structure of connected components, which has not been done before.

C.1 Analyzing Hatami–Molloy framework

In [HM12], the authors consider two parameters depending on sequence of degrees $\mathcal{D} = (d_v)_{v\in G}$:

$$Q := Q(\mathcal{D}) := \frac{\sum_{v\in G} d_v^2}{2|E|} - 2, \tag{105}$$

$$R := R(\mathcal{D}) := \frac{\sum_{v\in G} d_v(d_v-2)^2}{2|E|}. \tag{106}$$

They prove that if $|Q| = O(n^{-1/3}R^{2/3})$ then, with high probability, the size of the largest component will be of order $\Theta(n^{2/3}R^{2/3})$, i.e. the density of edges corresponds to the so-called *critical phase*. The second parameter R is just bounded by a constant in probability.

We can try to show that (a) $\mathbb{E}Q = O(n^{-1/3})$ and (b) $\operatorname{Var} Q = O(n^{-1})$.

The second statement is more simple if we assume that the sequence d_v consists of *almost* independent entries and $\operatorname{Var} d_v^2$ is asymptotically constant. In this case,

$$\operatorname{Var} Q(\mathcal{D}) \approx \frac{n}{4m^2}\operatorname{Var} d_1^2 = O(n^{-1}) \ . \tag{107}$$

To track the expectation $\mathbb{E}Q(\mathcal{D})$ inside our critical phase $m = \alpha n(1+\mu n^{-1/3})$, we use method of moments and marking procedure from analytic combinatorics [FS09] to study d_v.

We choose the vertex with label 1, which can be inside a tree, unicycle or a complex component. To track the degree of corresponding vertex, we introduce additional variable u, so that

$$G(z,u) = \sum_{n\geq 0} \frac{z^n}{n!} \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_{n,k} u^k \tag{108}$$

is an EGF for graphs with m edges, n vertices with vertex labelled 1 having k neighbors. After two applications of operator $u\dfrac{d}{du}$, we obtain the expectation of square $\mathbb{E}d_1^2$ by dividing corresponding quantities:

$$\frac{[z^n]\left(u\dfrac{d}{du}\right)^2 G(z,u)\Big|_{u=1}}{[z^n]G(z,1)} \tag{109}$$

In either of three cases we are able to apply the analytic lemma (Lemma 3 / Corollary 2) to obtain the final expressions. We don't want to complexify this answer by direct computation: we expect the answer to be $\mathbb{E}d_1^2 = 4\alpha + O(n^{-1/3})$. In this case, after substitution, we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}Q(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{4n\alpha + O(n^{2/3})}{2m} - 2 = O(n^{-1/3}) \tag{110}$$

We combine the estimates for expectation and variance with Chebyshev inequality to bound the parameter Q in probability.

C.2 Analyzing proportions of vertices of fixed degree

Another option is to study the distribution of vertices with some given degrees. This is possible by means of marking the corresponding variables.

In construction of a rooted tree, we used Δ-SET operator, so given $d \in \Delta$, in order to mark vertices of degree d, we mark corresponding vertices inside the tree, whose number of descendants is equal to $(d-1)$, so finally instead

$$T(z) = z\omega(T(z)) \tag{111}$$

we have

$$T(z,u) = z \cdot \left(\omega + (u-1)\frac{z^d}{d!}\right) \circ T(z) \tag{112}$$

We don't provide direct calculations either, but we predict that using this method we can prove that the proportion of vertices of each degree is asymptotically constant, so the number of such vertices is linear. However, we admit that our method restricts to the case when $|\mu| = O(n^{1/12})$. Thanks for reading this article.